

REMARKS

Claims 1-36 have been examined. Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 24, 25, 28-31, 33, 35 and 36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 9-23, 26, 27, 32, 34 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

I. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,184,996 to Gase (“Gase”).

Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 24, 25, 28-31, 33, 35 and 36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Gase.

A. Claim 1

Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited reference. For example, claim 1 recites that the host computer generates job data of the print job when a request is received from the printer, which is later than a time of receipt of the print job in the host computer.

As taught in Gase, when a job queue 28 of the printer 14 reaches a listed URL, the browser 26 of the printer 14 transmits a request to the client processor, wherein the specific “print job” corresponding to the URL is located (col. 3, lines 24-28). The client processor then responds with the “print job” (col. 3, lines 28-30). Based on the disclosure, it appears that the “print job” of Gase is data which has already been converted for printing. Therefore, Gase fails to teach or suggest that the converting is done when a request is received from the browser 26 (i.e. since it appears that the job data has already been generated, and is just waiting to be sent to the printer).

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited reference, and respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

B. Claim 3

Since claim 3 is dependent upon claim 1, Applicant submits that such claim is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

C. Claims 6, 24, 28 and 30

Since claims 6, 24, 28 and 30 contain features which are analogous to the features recited in claim 1, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable for at least similar reasons as set forth above.

D. Claims 8, 25, 29, 31, 33, 35 and 36

Since claims 8, 25, 29, 31, 33, 35 and 36 are dependent upon one of claims 6, 24, 28 and 30, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Gase in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,490,237 to Zimmerman et al. ("Zimmerman").

Claims 11-13 and 16-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gase in view of Zimmerman.

A. Claim 11

Applicant submits that claim 11 is patentable over the cited references. For example, claim 11 recites that the job request section sends a job request to the host computer according to a condition of the print engine and the receive buffer memory.

The Examiner acknowledges that Gase fails to disclose the above feature, but contends that Zimmerman does. In particular, the Examiner maintains that Zimmerman discloses a printer that processes a print job according to a condition of a receive buffer memory and a print engine. However, printer 12 of Zimmerman does not send a job request to the host computer 10 according to a condition of the print engine 34 and the I/O buffer RAM portions 40, 42. Rather, as disclosed in the reference, the host computer 10 determines the data transfer rate over the I/O 14 and sets the printer's buffer threshold based on the known speed of the print engine 34 (col. 5, lines 39-44). Therefore, it appears that any actions based on a condition of the print engine 34 and the I/O buffer RAM portions 40, 42, are taken by the host computer 10, rather than the printer 12. Thus, Applicant submits that Zimmerman fails to cure the deficient teachings of the Gase reference.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 11 is patentable over the cited references, and respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

B. Claims 12 and 13

Since claims 12 and 13 are dependent upon claim 11, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

C. Claims 16, 17 and 18

Since claim 16 contains features which are analogous to the features recited in claim 11, Applicant submits that claim 16 is patentable for at least analogous reasons as presented above.

In addition, since claims 17 and 18 are dependent upon claim 16, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

III. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Gase in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,385,728 to Debry (“Debry”).

Claims 2 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gase in view of Debry.

A. Claim 2

Claim 2 recites that a host computer sends job location data showing a location of job data to a print server. The print server temporarily stores the job location data and sends it to the printer. The printer then sends the job request, which the job location data shows, to the host computer.

In the November 10, 2003 Amendment, Applicant argued that the user 20 of Debry does not function as a printer server. In response, the Examiner maintains that user 20 is a computer, and Debry teaches that computer 20 would perform both a server function, as well as other functions (pg. 39 of Office Action where Examiner cites to col. 7, lines 15-25; col. 8, lines 50-65). However, contrary to the Examiner’s assertions, Applicant submits that the cited portions

fail to disclose that user 20 performs a server function. Rather, the reference discloses that the “print server” is a “computer that manages the function of a printer and device queuing either as a computer that is solely dedicated to such management, or as a computer that performs other tasks besides such management.” (col. 6, line 62 - col. 7, line 1). The reference fails to teach or such suggest that the user 20 performs the server function of the print server (i.e. col. 6, lines 60-62). Therefore, Applicant submits that user 20 of Debry fails to disclose the claimed print server.

Further, as stated above, claim 2 recites that the print server temporarily stores the job location data and sends it to the printer. On the other hand, Debry fails to disclose that the user 20 sends the will-call certificate 40 to a printer. Therefore, even if Applicant assumed *arguendo* that the user 20 discloses the claimed print server, Debry would still fail to teach or suggest the claimed limitation. For example, as set forth in the November 10, 2003 Amendment, the user 20 takes the will-call certificate 40 and builds a print request (col. 7, lines 43-45). The user 20 sends the print request to the print server 30 (Fig. 1, lines 43-45). Print server 30 receives the request and then goes to document source 10 to request the document (col. 7, lines 50-51). In particular, print server 30 gives the will-call certificate 40 to document source 10 to verify that the printer is allowed to get that document (col. 7, lines 51-53). After verification, document source 10 sends the requested document to the printer (col. 8, lines 32-36).

As set forth above, the user 20 does not send job location data to the printer. Rather, it appears that the document source 10 is the element that sends any type of information to the

printer. Accordingly, since Debry fails to cure the deficient teachings of Gase, Applicant submits that claim 2 is patentable over the cited reference.

B. Claim 7

Since claim 7 contains features which are analogous to the features recited in claim 2, Applicant submits that such claim is patentable for at least analogous reasons as presented above.

IV. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Gase and in view of Pipeline Corporation (col. 1, lines 48-60 of Gase) (“Pipeline”).

Claims 4, 5, 9, 10, 26, 27, 32 and 34 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gase in view of Pipeline.

A. Claim 4

Applicant submits that claim 4 is patentable over the cited references. For example, claim 4 recites that a printer can specify a desired part of job data when the printer sends a job request to a host computer. In response, the host computer sends only the specified part of the job data to the printer.

The Examiner acknowledges that Gase fails to teach or suggest the above features, but contends that Pipeline does. However, Pipeline just discloses that a printer can be programmed to retrieve and print pages that are hyperlinked to an original document of a website (col. 1, lines 57-60). As noted above, claim 4 recites that the claimed printer can specify a desired part of the job data, where the job data is data generated from a print job (i.e. due to claim 4’s dependency

on claim 1). Pipeline fails to disclose that the “original document” is the job data (i.e. data generated from a print job), such that the hyperlinked pages are a “desired part” of the job data. Rather, since the reference discloses that the printer is “programmed” to retrieve the hyperlinked pages, it appears that the hyperlinked pages actually form the job data (i.e. the portion specified or programmed by a user to be printed). Thus, the reference fails to teach or suggest that the printer can specify a desired part of the alleged job data (i.e. a desired part of the specified hyperlinked pages).

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 4 is patentable over the combination of the cited references, and respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

In addition, Applicant submits that claim 4 is patentable over the combination of the cited references at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 1.

B. Claims 5, 9, 10, 26, 27, 32 and 34

Since claims 5, 9, 10, 26, 27, 32 and 34 contain features which are analogous to the features recited in claim 4, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable for at least analogous reasons as presented above.

V. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Gase in view of Zimmerman and Pipeline Corporation.

Claims 14, 15, 19 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gase in view of Zimmerman and Pipeline. However, since claims 14, 15, 19 and 20 contain features which are analogous to the features recited in claim 4, and Zimmerman fails to cure the deficient teachings of Pipeline, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable for at least analogous reasons as presented above in claim 4.

VI. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Gase in view of Debry.

Claims 21-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gase in view of Debry.

A. Claim 21

Since claim 21 contains features which are analogous to the features recited in claim 2, Applicant submits that claim 21 is patentable over the cited references for at least analogous reasons as presented in claim 2. In particular, Applicant submits that user 20 of Debry fails to teach or disclose the claimed print server (Fig. 1).

Accordingly, since Debry fails to cure the deficient teachings of Gase, Applicant submits that claim 21 is patentable over the cited references.

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Application No. 09/353,383

B. Claims 22 and 23

Since claims 22 and 23 contain features which are analogous to the features of claim 21, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable for at least analogous reasons as presented above.

VII. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Allison M. Tulino
Registration No. 48,294

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 20, 2004